This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,530	05/15/2001	Reto Sieber	F 6817	5031
7:	590 04/16/2003			
Jordan and Hamburg			EXAMINER	
122 East 42nd New York, NY			AHMAD, NASSER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1772	
			DATE MAILED: 04/16/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. 09/762,530

Applicant(s)

Sieber et al.

Office Action Summary Examiner

Nasser Ahmad

Art Unit 1772



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
	for Reply	
THE I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
	ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In date of this communication.	no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
- If the p	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the	
- Failure	to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the	
	ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of t patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	his communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status		
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 10, 2	003
2a) 💢	This action is FINAL . 2b) \square This act	ion is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance eclosed in accordance with the practice under $Ex\ partial$	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is rte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>11-31</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	la) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 🗶	Claim(s) <u>11-31</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers	
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	to this Office action.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No
	application from the International Bure	
*S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th	
14)∐	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
<u></u>	The translation of the foreign language provisiona	
15)∟	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachm		4) The situation Common (DTO 412) Person No.
_	stice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:
2, X 1, 11	omittion observation orationionitial it 10-1449/ Eubot Holet.	** C ******

Art Unit: 1772

4}

- 1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-29 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 11-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchal (GB: 2,063,710).

Marchal relates to a double-sided, self-adhesive sheet comprising a backing layer of synthetic material (page 2, col. 2, lines 116-119) and the adhesive are tacky with one side adhesive having a strength different from the other side adhesive. As shown in the drawings, the second adhesive is planar. Also, because the adhesive is tacky and sticky, it is pressure sensitive adhesive. In page-2, col. 1, lines 31-36, a textile structure is arranged on at least the top surface of the backing layer. The textile structure is a weave of intersecting thread, which would be forming a mesh arrangement. The reference also teaches a method of bonding a floor covering to a floor. However, Marchal fails to teach that the sheet is at least 350 mm wide. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Marchal by providing said width of at least 350 mm, based on optimization through routine experimentation, as the reference also is directed to the same field as the instant application and coverage extent would be obvious optimization.

Art Unit: 1772

Similarly, the adhesive strengths would also have been obvious based on optimization through routine experimentation.

Further, the process conditions in the product claims have not been given patentable, as said conditions are not germane to the patentability of the product itself.

4. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchal.

Marchal, as discussed above, discloses the claimed invention except for floor being parquet and the backing being polyethylene or polypropylene film. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide polyethylene or polypropylene film, or parquet floor, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

The use of a known material also would have been obvious in the absence of any criticality shown in the application.

5. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchal.

Marchal, as discussed above, discloses the claimed invention except for a second textile structure. It would have been obvious t one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide for the second textile structure for enhancing reinforcement to the sheet, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. vs. Benis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Art Unit: 1772

6. The substitute specification filed with amendment (Paper No. 8) on January 10, 2003 have been received and entered into the application.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication the examiner should be directed to Nasser Ahmad whose telephone number is (703) 308-4424. The examiner can generally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (703) 308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 305-7115 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1772

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

N. Ahmad/dh April 15, 2003 NASSER AHMAD PRIMARY EXAMINER